

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
11 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
12 CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO
individually and on behalf of all similarly
situated,

13 Plaintiffs,
14 vs.
15 GOOGLE LLC,
16 Defendant.

Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE SUPPLEMENT IN
SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR
ORDER REQUIRING GOOGLE TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY IT SHOULD
NOT BE SANCTIONED FOR
DISCOVERY MISCONDUCT
PURSUANT TO L.R. 7-11**

18 Having considered the Administrative Motion to File Supplement in Support of Their
19 Request for Order Requiring Google to Show Cause Why It Should Not Be Sanctioned for
20 Discovery Misconduct pursuant to Local Rule 7-11 filed by Plaintiffs, the Court finds there is
21 good cause to **GRANT** the motion. **Plaintiffs' supplement is deemed added to their original
motion for sanctions (Dkt. 430). The deadline and page limits for Google's opposition to the
IT IS SO ORDERED. motion for sanctions, as supplemented, is addressed in the Order at
Dkt. 508.**

22
23 Dated: March 22, 2022


24 _____
25 SUSAN VAN KEULEN
26 United States Magistrate Judge
27
28